UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,677	12/09/1999	YASH SHARMA	35284-03200(	2550

7590 09/19/2005

Dr. Yash P. Sharma
Medicine and Applied Sciences, Inc.
1420 Spring Hill Road
Suite 600
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
SCHWADRON, RONALD B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/474,677	SHARMA, YASH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *4,5 and 21-31* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 6-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 February 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner. as per PTO-948 of 2/5/2001

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Foreign language references cited in the IDS of 4/5/2005 were not considered because said references were not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3)(i) or (ii). Internet references cited on said IDS were not considered because said references lacked the required information as per MPEP section 707.05(b), section IV.

2. In order to avoid abandonment, the drawing informalities noted in the PTO 948 mailed on 2/5/2001, must now be corrected. Correction can only be effected in the manner set forth in the above noted paper. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). A computer readable form (CRF) of the sequence listing was submitted. However, the CRF could not be processed by the Scientific and Technical Information Center (STIC) for the reason(s) set forth on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report.

Applicant is given ONE MONTH, or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this letter within which to comply with the sequence rules, 37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825. Failure to comply with these requirements will result in ABANDONMENT of the application under 37 CFR 1.821(g). Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no case may an applicant extend the period for reply beyond the SIX MONTH statutory period. Direct the reply to the undersigned. Applicant is requested to return a copy of the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report with the reply.

4. Claims 1-3,6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a

way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification is not enabling for the claimed method of treating HIV. The specification does not disclose how to use the instant invention for the in vivo treatment of HIV infection in humans. Applicant has not enabled the breadth of the claimed invention in view of the teachings of the specification because the use for the instant invention disclosed in the specification is the in vivo treatment of HIV infection in humans. The state of the art is such that is unpredictable in the absence of appropriate evidence as to how the instant invention could be used for the in vivo treatment of HIV infection in humans. Judge Lourie stated in Enzo Biochem Inc. v. Calgene Inc. CAFC 52 USPQ2d 1129 that:

The statutory basis for the enablement requirement is found in Section 112, Para. 1, which provides in relevant part that:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same. . . .35 U.S.C. Section 112, Para. 1 (1994). "To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without 'undue experimentation.' " Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, A/S , 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting In re Wright , 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Whether claims are sufficiently enabled by a disclosure in a specification is determined as of the date that the patent application was first filed, see Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc. , 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986), which in this case is October 20, 1983 for both the '931 and '149 patents.

We have held that a patent specification complies with the statute even if a "reasonable" amount of routine experimentation is required in order to practice a claimed invention, but that such experimentation must not be "undue." See, e.g., Wands , 858 F.2d at 736-37, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 ("Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation . . . . However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue

experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.' ") (footnotes, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). In In re Wands , we set forth a number of factors which a court may consider in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors were set forth as follows:

(1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Id. at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. We have also noted that all of the factors need not be reviewed when determining whether a disclosure is enabling. See Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., Ltd. , 927 F.2d 1200, 1213, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (noting that the Wands factors "are illustrative, not mandatory. What is relevant depends on the facts.").

Regarding Wands factors 4,5,7,8 the claimed method is a method of treating HIV infection in humans, wherein it was well known in the art that HIV infection has proven refractory to a variety of different therapies. Fahey et al. (U) (Clin. Exp. Immunol. 89:1, 1992) address therapeutic strategies in the treatment of HIV and indicate that such therapies are promising but not yet realized (see entire document). Fahey et al. further teach that *in vitro* results do not predict successful *in vivo* treatment using the same agents (see page 3 and page 4, in particular). Regarding Wands factors 2 and 3, the specification contains in vitro experiment using the agent recited in the claims and zero evidence regarding the in vivo use of the claimed invention. Regarding factor 1, in view of the high unpredictability as to whether the agent recited in the claim would have any effect on HIV infection in vivo and the absence of any in vivo data in the specification, it would require extensive experimentation to determine if the claimed invention could be used to treat HIV infection in vivo in humans. In addition, the Tangvoranuntakul et al. reference indicate that humans obtain glycolylneuraminic acid via normal dietary sources (see entire reference), yet there is no evidence that such ingestion of glycolylneuraminic acid provides any effect on HIV infection.

There is insufficient guidance in the specification as to how to practice the instant invention. Undue experimentation would be required of one skilled in the art to practice the instant invention. See In re Wands 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988).

5. Claims 1-3,6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed invention. The legal standard for sufficiency of a patent's (or a specification's) written description is whether that description "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the. . .claimed subject matter", Vas-Cath, Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the instant case, the specification does not convey to the artisan that the applicant had possession at the time of invention of the claimed inventions.

The clams encompass use of a N-glycolylneuraminic acid derivative to treat HIV. The specification discloses that said derivative is "similar in structure to N-glycolylneuraminic". The specification does not specifically define what "similar in structure to N-glycolylneuraminic acid" encompasses. The claims encompass use of a vast undisclosed genus of agents with the aforementioned property that are not disclosed in the specification wherein said agents can be used to treat HIV. The structure of such agents is not disclosed. With the exception of N-glycolylneuraminic and the specific derivatives disclosed in the specification (such as those recited in claim 17 and 18), the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed structure of the encompassed derivatives and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. In the instant application, the amino acid itself or isolated molecule is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Lts., 18 USPQ2d 1016.

In view of the aforementioned problems regarding description of the claimed invention, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention claimed herein. See The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404-7 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1995) the inventors claimed a genus of DNA species encoding insulin in different vertebrates or mammals, but had only described a single species of cDNA which encoded rat insulin. The court held that only the nucleic acids species described in the specification (i.e. nucleic acids encoding rat insulin) met the description requirement and that the inventors were not entitled to a claim encompassing a genus of nucleic acids encoding insulin from other vertebrates, mammals or humans, id. at 1240. The Federal Circuit has held that if an inventor is "unable to envision the detailed constitution of a gene so as to distinguish it from other materials. . .conception has not been achieved until reduction to practice has occurred", Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 016 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Attention is also directed to the decision of The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company (CAFC, July 1997) wherein is stated:

"The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material. Thus, as we have previously held, a cDNA is not defined or described by the mere name "cDNA," even if accompanied by the name of the protein that it encodes, but requires a kind of specificity usually achieved by means of the recitation of the sequence of nucleotides that make up the cDNA." See Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3,6-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter for the reasons elaborated in the previous Office Action. Applicants arguments have been considered and deemed not persuasive.

Regarding the Sharma declaration filed 12/6/2004, the following comments are made. Regarding comments in section 6 of said declaration, the various documents supplied with the amendment filed 1/28/2002 (Pre-IND Meeting agenda 9/18/1997) indicate communications with various individuals cited *before* the filing date of the parent applications of the instant application. No copy of the "secrecy agreement" has been provided so it is unclear as to what said document states. There is also reference to a variety of individuals in the hand written sheet attached to the "Pre-IND Meeting agenda 9/18/1997" document (amendment filed 1/28/2002) wherein said individuals are not employees of NIH (Finbloom, etc). Said individuals have not been addressed in the instant declaration.

8. Claims 1-3,6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter as evidenced by Minarcik (Diagnosis For Hire).

The Minarcik document, page 11, section 5 indicates that Minarcik worked with Sharma in the identification of N-glycolylneuraminic acid as the agent present in ANKA which would be used to treat HIV. However, Minarcik is not listed as an inventor of the instant invention.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-3,6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minarcik (1996 August 26, sci.med.aids mailing list)

Minarcik discloses "LUKOR" (a supernatant which contains N-glycolylneuraminic acid, it was the supernatant from which applicant identified N-glycolylneuraminic acid as an active ingredient). Minarcik discloses that LUKOR has in vitro activity against HIV (see entire reference). Minarcik does not disclose use of said agent to treat HIV in vivo. Minarcik discloses that studies should be conducted in vivo in humans to establish the potential use of LUKOR as an antiiHIV drug. The various dosages used in the claims would be determined as routine optimization. Minarcik suggest that LUKOR could potentially be administered orally (see reference). A routineer would have tested other art known modes of administration as part of routine optimization. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have created the claimed method because Minarcik discloses that LUKOR has in vitro activity against HIV and Minarcik discloses that studies should be conducted in vivo in humans to establish the potential use of LUKOR as an antiiHIV drug.

11. No claim is allowed.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-6:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571

272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644

RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ~~1800~~

Raw Sequence Listing Error Summary

ERROR DETECTED	SUGGESTED CORRECTION	SERIAL NUMBER: 09/474,677C

ATTN: NEW RULES CASES: PLEASE DISREGARD ENGLISH "ALPHA" HEADERS, WHICH WERE INSERTED BY PTO SOFTWARE

1	Wrapped Nucleics Wrapped Aminos	The number/text at the end of each line "wrapped" down to the next line. This may occur if your file was retrieved in a word processor after creating it. Please adjust your right margin to .3; this will prevent "wrapping."
2	Invalid Line Length	The rules require that a line not exceed 72 characters in length. This includes white spaces.
3	Misaligned Amino Numbering	The numbering under each 5th amino acid is misaligned. Do not use tab codes between numbers; use space characters, instead.
4	Non-ASCII	The submitted file was not saved in ASCII(DOS) text, as required by the Sequence Rules. Please ensure your subsequent submission is saved in ASCII text.
5	Variable Length	Sequence(s)____contain n's or Xaa's representing more than one residue. Per Sequence Rules, each n or Xaa can only represent a single residue. Please present the maximum number of each residue having variable length and indicate in the <220>-<223> section that some may be missing.
6	PatentIn 2.0 "bug"	A "bug" in PatentIn version 2.0 has caused the <220>-<223> section to be missing from amino acid sequences(s) _____. Normally, PatentIn would automatically generate this section from the previously coded nucleic acid sequence. Please manually copy the relevant <220>-<223> section to the subsequent amino acid sequence. This applies to the mandatory <220>-<223> sections for Artificial or Unknown sequences.
7	Skipped Sequences (OLD RULES)	Sequence(s) ____ missing. If intentional, please insert the following lines for each skipped sequence: (2) INFORMATION FOR SEQ ID NO:X: (insert SEQ ID NO where "X" is shown) (i) SEQUENCE CHARACTERISTICS: (Do not insert any subheadings under this heading) (xi) SEQUENCE DESCRIPTION:SEQ ID NO:X: (insert SEQ ID NO where "X" is shown) This sequence is intentionally skipped Please also adjust the "(ii) NUMBER OF SEQUENCES:" response to include the skipped sequences.
8	Skipped Sequences (NEW RULES)	Sequence(s) _____ missing. If intentional, please insert the following lines for each skipped sequence. <210> sequence id number <400> sequence id number 000
9	Use of n's or Xaa's (NEW RULES)	Use of n's and/or Xaa's have been detected in the Sequence Listing. Per 1.823 of Sequence Rules, use of <220>-<223> is MANDATORY if n's or Xaa's are present. In <220> to <223> section, please explain location of n or Xaa, and which residue n or Xaa represents.
10	Invalid <213> Response	Per 1.823 of Sequence Rules, the only valid <213> responses are: Unknown, Artificial Sequence, or scientific name (Genus/species). <220>-<223> section is required when <213> response is Unknown or is Artificial Sequence
11	Use of <220>	~~Sequence(s) _____ missing the <220> "Feature" and associated numeric identifiers and responses.~~ Use of <220> to <223> is MANDATORY if <213> "Organism" response is "Artificial Sequence" or "Unknown." Please explain source of genetic material in <220> to <223> section. (See "Federal Register," 06/01/1998, Vol. 63, No. 104, pp. 29631-32) (Sec. 1.823 of Sequence Rules)
12	PatentIn 2.0 "bug"	Please do not use "Copy to Disk" function of PatentIn version 2.0. This causes a corrupted file, resulting in missing mandatory numeric identifiers and responses (as indicated on raw sequence listing). Instead, please use "File Manager" or any other manual means to copy file to floppy disk.
13	Misuse of n/Xaa	"n" can only represent a single nucleotide; "Xaa" can only represent a single amino acid

IFW16

RAW SEQUENCE LISTING DATE: 04/26/2005
PATENT APPLICATION: US/09/474,677C TIME: 11:34:50

Input Set : A:\Sequence Listing.ST25.txt
Output Set: N:\CRF4\04262005\I474677C.raw

```
      3 <110> APPLICANT: Sharma, Yash P.
      5 <120> TITLE OF INVENTION: Treatment and Prevention of HIV and Other Viral Infections
      7 <130> FILE REFERENCE: 66262-00001
      9 <140> CURRENT APPLICATION NUMBER: 09/474,677C
C--> 10 <141> CURRENT FILING DATE: 1999-12-09
     12 <150> PRIOR APPLICATION NUMBER: 60/114,540
     13 <151> PRIOR FILING DATE: 1998-12-29
     15 <150> PRIOR APPLICATION NUMBER: 09/015,830
     16 <151> PRIOR FILING DATE: 1998-01-29
     18 <160> NUMBER OF SEQ ID NOS: 1
     20 <170> SOFTWARE: PatentIn version 3.3
     22 <210> SEQ ID NO: 1
     23 <211> LENGTH: 9
     24 <212> TYPE: PRT
     25 <213> ORGANISM: Artificial Sequence
     27 <220> FEATURE:
     28 <223> OTHER INFORMATION: Artificial Sequence
     30 <400> SEQUENCE: 1
     32 Ala Ser Gln Asn Tyr Pro Ile Val Gln
     33 1               5
```

Does Not Comply
Corrected Diskette Needed

Invalid response..
(give source of genetic material. See item 11 on Error Summary Sheet.)

VERIFICATION SUMMARY DATE: 04/26/2005
PATENT APPLICATION: US/09/474,677C TIME: 11:34:51

Input Set : A:\Sequence Listing.ST25.txt
Output Set: N:\CRF4\04262005\I474677C.raw

L:10 M:271 C: Current Filing Date differs, Replaced Current Filing Date